DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 109 949 HE 006 519

| | |
|---|---|
| TITLE | Federal-State Responsibility for Facilitating Student Access. Policy Analysis Service Reports, Vol. 1, No. 2. |
| INSTITUTION | American Council on Education, Washington, D.C. Policy Analysis Service. |
| PUB DATE | Mar 75 |
| NOTE | 20p. |
| AVAILABLE FROM | Policy Analysis Service, American Council on Education, One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C. 20036 |
| EDRS PRICE | MF-$0.76 HC-$1.58 PLUS POSTAGE |
| DESCRIPTORS | *Educational Opportunities; Federal Aid; Federal Legislation; Federal Programs; *Federal State Relationship; *Higher Education; Open Enrollment; Post Secondary Education; Scholarships; State Aid; *State Legislation |
| IDENTIFIERS | City University of New York; CUNY; SSIG; *State Student Incentive Grants |

ABSTRACT

During the spring of 1974 a series of seminars on student aid programs and student access was held in connection with the congressional hearings on Title IV of the Higher Education Act. Participants represented the federal, state, or institutional point of view. This document reporting on those seminars, deals with federal-state responsibilities in facilitating student access to postsecondary education. This topic is particularly thorny for two reasons. First, clear-cut federal legislative policy for postsecondary education has been lacking, at least until the 1972 Education Amendments with their initiation of a program of state scholarships and their creation on the 1202 Commissions. Second, the 50 states differ greatly on variety of important variables: legislation, the mix of public and private institutions, student migration patterns, arrangements for financial postsecondary education, and level of financial support for the total system. In addition to these two major problems, many other difficulties arise in trying to apportion responsibility between the federal government and the states. Some of these difficulties discussed by the five panel members are: (1) The Federal Role; (2) The Promise of SSIG; The Goals of State Aid, and The Complementary Roles of State and Federal Programs; (3) The CUNY Experience; (4) A Challenge from the Private Sector; (5) The Paradox of "Access", The Scorecard, and Increasing Student Choice. (Author/KE)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

# REPORT OF A SEMINAR HELD JULY 9, 1974
# Sponsored by POLICY ANALYSIS SERVICE of the AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION

POLICY ANALYSIS SERVICE REPORTS
Vol. 1, No. 2
March 1975

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION • WASHINGTON, D.C.

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION

Roger W. Heyns, President

The American Council on Education, founded in 1918 and composed of institutions of higher education and national and regional associations, is the nation's major coordinating body for postsecondary education. Through voluntary and cooperative action, the Council provides comprehensive leadership for improving educational standards, policies, and procedures.

POLICY ANALYSIS SERVICE STAFF

John F. Hughes, Director

Engin I. Holmstrom
Policy Associate

Patricia Smith
Policy Associate

Carol Van Alstyne
Chief Economist

Catherine Henderson
Research Analyst

Donna Phillips
Annual Meeting Coordinator

Constance J. Falwell
Secretary

Ida E. Green
Secretary

Mel Kelley
Secretary

Additional copies of this report are available from the Policy Analysis Service, American Council on Education, One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C. 20036.

# P R E F A C E

The Policy Analysis Service of the American Council on Education was created to give the Council a new ability to respond to public policy issues in higher education. The PAS prepares analyses of government actions, national social and economic developments, and trends in institutions of higher education; in addition, it provides information to ACE member institutions and associations. A major activity is convening seminars and meetings on issues of national policy. These seminars and meetings bring together representatives of congressional committees, the executive branch, state governments, institutions, and educational associations. Reports of meetings, analytic reports, and briefing papers will appear in the Policy Analysis Service Reports, and be made available to the membership.

During the spring 1974 a series of seminars on student aid programs and student access was held in connection with the congressional hearings on Title IV of the Higher Education Act. Since congressional hearings concerning the modification and extension of the Higher Education Act are continuing in 1975, this seminar report on the variations between federal and state responsibilities in providing student assistance will serve to communicate widely some of the critical issues and concerns raised by the participants who represent the federal, state, or institutional point of view. The report in final form owes much to the expert editorial work performed by Laura Kent.

The PAS hopes that readers will find the Reports series informative, and will communicate comments or questions to the PAS staff.

John F. Hughes
Director
Policy Analysis Service

PRESENTATIONS

Philip Austin, Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Education (Policy Development), U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

- The Federal Role

Joseph D. Boyd, Executive Director, Illinois State Scholarship Commission

- The Promise of the SSIG
- The Goals of State Aid
- Complementary Roles of State and Federal Programs

Henry Paley, Deputy to the Chancellor for University Relations, City University of New York

- The CUNY Experience

Hans Jenny, Vice President, Wooster College (Ohio)

- A Challenge from the Private Sector

Robert Carbone, Professor of Higher Education, University of Maryland

- The Paradox of "Access"
- The Scorecard
- Increasing Student Choice

REPORT ON ACE/PAS SEMINAR:

FEDERAL-STATE RESPONSIBILITY FOR FACILITATING STUDENT ACCESS

JULY 9, 1974

This meeting, another in a series of seminars sponsored by the American Council on Education's Policy Analysis Service, dealt with federal-state responsibilities in facilitating student access to postsecondary education. This topic is particularly thorny for two basic reasons. First, though there is a long-standing and extensive legislative history of federal legislation in the area of elementary and secondary education, clear-cut federal legislative policy for postsecondary education has been lacking, at least until the 1972 Education Amendments with their initiation of a program of state scholarships and their creation on the 1202 commissions. Second, the 50 states differ greatly on a variety of important variables: legislation, the mix of public and private institutions, student migration patterns, arrangements for financing postsecondary education, and level of financial support for the total system. In addition to these two major problems, many other difficulties arise in trying to apportion responsibility between the federal government and the states. Some of these difficulties were discussed by the five panel members, each of whom represented a particular point of view.

## The Federal Role

Philip Austin, Senior Economist and Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Education (Policy Development), Department of Health, Education and Welfare, pointed out that before one can address the subject of the federal role in providing access, one must have a general notion of the responsibilities of all partners in supporting education. Ernest Boyer's statement in the report of the National Commission on the Financing of Postsecondary Education sets forth some valuable guiding principles that are largely consistent with current federal student assistance strategies.[1] First, state and local governments have the

[1] Financing Postsecondary Education in the United States (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1973), pp. 361-67.

primary public responsibility for providing general institutional support; this can be taken to mean that states and localities are responsibile for creating and maintaining a system that produces educational services. In addition, states and localities ought to consider supporting private institutions for specific and well-defined purposes. Finally, families (except perhaps for those in very low-income brackets) have responsibility for providing some financial support. These basic assumptions form the conceptual foundation for a discussion of the federal role.

One of the federal government's responsibilities is to address the goal of access/equality of opportunity. A second area of federal responsibility is research and development, whereby it also implicitly supports graduate education. A third general area in which the federal government has historically played a role is the achievement of certain goals related to national manpower. That is, after identifying high-priority areas for which the manpower and educational systems do not seem to be producing enough trained people, the federal government has traditionally responded -- through grants, scholarships, institutional project grants, and so forth -- to bring into partial equilibrium the supply and demand of trained people in any given substantive area. The fourth general area in which the federal government has a responsibility is that of educational renewal, innovation, reform. This responsibility has traditionally been carried out through the use of pilot and demonstration projects.

The area that is the subject of this seminar is equality of access. It is generally acknowledged that this goal is a legitimate federal concern and, in the last few years at least, it has been addressed by the federal government through the student assistance provisions of the 1972 Education Amendments. The Basic Opportunity Grants program is looked upon as being the primary federal mechanism for providing access, particularly to low-income students. Loans can be regarded as addressing the next goal: that of choice. Loans can also address access and

choice goals for middle-income and upper-income students who do not qualify for BOGs.

In addition to specific programs that address the access and choice goals, the federal government attempts to reduce or eliminate imperfections in the capital market, which seems to have a historic and systematic bias against investment in human, as opposed to physical, capital. To whatever degree they have been successful, SALLIE MAE, guaranteed loan programs, etc., have attempted to compensate for these deficiences and to allow any individual who is eligible to attend an accredited institution to do so.

In the broadest sense, it is not the size of any given program that ought to be addressed. It is the type and quality of educational service that is ultimately delivered to the individual student that ought to be the concern of policy-makers at all levels. Unless we have some notion as to how states, localities, 1202 commissions, faculty members, institutional decision-makers, and state legislators, for instance, are going to respond to the differential incentives created by federal programs, the question of what the federal strategy should be is almost unanswerable. The Brookings Institution is beginning investigations of this type, but we do not really have much concrete information at this point. This is a most basic question, but realistically the precise, analytical answers will not be available in the immediate future, so public policy at all levels must be made without absolute knowledge.

In general, it can be said that equality of access has been and is a primary goal of the federal government and, in recent years, it has addressed this goal through the mechanism of an aggressive student assistance strategy including Basic Opportunity Grants, Guaranteed Student Loans, and the traditional campus-based programs (Supplementary Educational Opportunity Grants, National Direct Student Loans, College Work-Study).

## The Promise of the SSIG

The second speaker was Joseph D. Boyd, Executive Director of the Illinois State Scholarship Commission, who commented on the great potential of the State Student Incentive Grants program (SSIG) and on the unique role the states (as opposed to the federal government) can play in providing nonrepayable gift aid.

The federal SSIG will become a reality with the 1974-75 awards of $19 million, creating a partnership of about 5 percent federal and 95 percent state funds. Additional SSIG funds in future years, requiring additional dollars of state funds, will mean that every dollar of such federal funds will yield an additional dollar of state grant aid to needy students. Thus, this state-federal partnership may contribute significantly to the accomplishment of the mutual goals of access and reasonable choice.

Because of the State Student Incentive Grants program, not only will there be at least fourteen new state programs in 1974-75 that would not otherwise exist but also those states with existing programs will be able to expand them. According to the latest figures, in 1973-74, about $364 million in state funds helped some 735,000 students. In 1974-75, the total of need-based monetary awards in all states is $457 million assisting 800,000 students. State student aid is rapidly growing at a time when other state dollars for higher education are remaining constant.

## The Goals of State Aid

Why should we have programs of student aid at the state level? What goals should they serve? What roles should they play? Briefly stated, the objectives of such programs are:

1. To equalize educational opportunity by removing financial barriers to attendance in a postsecondary institution. Reasonable choice as well as access is a goal; but every state that has debated between the two alternatives has concluded that, when funds are limited, access must have the higher priority, with reasonable choice a very close second. In fact, most states have constructed their award system so as to permit tuition equalization, thus making reasonable choice a reality.

2. To preserve diversity in postsecondary education by permitting freedom of institutional choice: that is, allowing reasons other than financial status to operate in a student's selection of one institution over another.

3. To conserve public funds by aiding needy students to attend nonpublic institutions where otherwise space and programs might not be fully utilized. With enrollment stabilizing, as it has in the last few years, one might well ask: Should we not be concerned about vacancies in public institutions? And of course we are. In Illinois, enrollments in both public and private four-year colleges have been stabilized through the existence of the SSIG program. When a state resident attends a nonpublic institution, it means that private dollars are assisting in total operational/capital costs which, had the student elected to attend a public institution, would have been additional taxpayer costs.

4. To provide a source of funds so that low-income students do not have to rely solely on loan funds or on earnings from employment to finance their college education. If work and loans are the only sources, the goal of access for these students will not be reached. Many of the most severely needy students have seen the dire effects that credit or loans may have on family life; therefore, unlimited loan money is not the answer for this nation in achieving full access to postsecondary education.

5. To permit a means, if desired, for setting tuition charges at state institutions that can be met fully by applicants from families with adequate financial strength while at the same time allowing those with fewer resources to receive nonrepayable grants that will cover the entire amount of required tuition and mandatory fees. Though not the original purpose of state aid programs, this objective has evolved over time. Governors and legislators have seen a means by which tuitions can be increased so that those who can pay them do pay, whereas those who are adversely affected by them have a source of grant aid.

6. To bring into existence an open or free market for the student as a consumer of postsecondary education. Currently, there is much conern about quality and accountability in higher education. The free market concept permits students to select the school whose curriculum and programs are most relevant to them and of sufficiently high quality to justify the time and effort spent in accomplishing their educational or career goals. Some say this concept of the use of student aid dollars is idealistic; others say it is one of the best routes available for letting consumers determine what they want.

7. To make students and their families aware of the significant role that their state tax dollars pay as investments in them in the form of loans or grants. A grant or loan to the individual student carries a direct message of interest in him or her as a person and of the importance of education as a high public purpose. State appropriations spent on bricks and faculty salaries simply cannot deliver the same message.

These seven objectives highlight some of the important roles of student assistance programs in statewide planning. Once these roles or goals are identified, state student aid programs are a means to the desired ends. Not all states will agree on the rank ordering of the various goals or will have the same priority of goals as the federal government. At present, an imbalance in funding exists that is contrary to the best interests of the country: Five states, representing 34 percent of the nation's population, now have 69 percent of the gift-aid money for students. As more states become involved for the first time in SSIG, the great differences in the availability of student aid depending on where a person happens to live will to some extent be corrected, and a healthier balance achieved.

Complementary Roles of State and Federal Programs

The biggest challenge is to find how state and federal student aid programs can complement each other rather than overlap and replace each other. The following are some suggestions.

The new federal program of Basic Opportunity Grants is predominantly "access" money targeted to low-income students and designed to permit them to attend some college but not necessarily any college. It is a universal program of entitlement. Almost all state programs, on the other hand, are planned to provide both access and reasonable choice to the needy student. When state programs have sufficient funds, or when certain state programs are made available only to higher-cost schools ($37.3 million, or about 10 percent, of the 1973-74 total state monetary award dollars were for programs of tuition equalization at nonpublic institutions), need is determined on a relative basis. To determine relative need means to compare the financial strength of a given family or applicant with the total cost of the institution of the applicant's choice and, where a difference exists, to make an award as long as state funds are available.

Many state programs, therefore, are assisting tens of thousands of students who do not qualify for a Basic Grant. To students from middle-income families, such a grant may make the difference between access and nonaccess as well as allowing a reasonable choice. A partnership whereby Basic Grants are viewed chiefly as "access" funds and state programs chiefly as "reasonable choice" funds is clear in purpose and allows each partner to play a significant role in promoting those qualities that distinguish the educational system of the United States from those of other countries. Students of all ages seeking addtional education after high school should not be confronted with financial barriers that keep them from this opportunity. In addition, by providing needy students with a reasonable choice among institutions, this nation can proclaim the desirability of a strong dual system of public and nonpublic institutions.

If these mutual goals are to be accomplished, the huge problem of coordination must be solved. A common student aid application should be developed, and those states which prove themselves able to do so should be given the authority to calculate and announce Basic Grant entitlements to their residents. Without coordination, almost $1 billion in Basic Grants and state awards in 1974-75 will simply not reach all the people for whom they are intended.

States can be delivery agents for federal student aid dollars. Some coordination has already begun. During May and June, most states will receive a listing of all their Basic Grants applicants for 1974-75 awards; this will permit a packaging of state and federal funds. The Basic Grants can become a floor upon which to build additional needed and available state aid.

Federal aid programs for students enrolled in postsecondary education require a delivery agent. As a working partnership under a creative new federalism, contracts of understanding with specific authorities and responsibilities can and should be made available to state scholarship agencies that are already staffed and experienced in dealing with students who apply for

financial assistance. The ultimate goal is to permit a student and his or her family to file a single application form and to receive a concise response that will indicate what, if any, federal and state taxpayer benefits are available for use at the educational institution of choice.

## The CUNY Experience

Henry Paley, Deputy to the Chancellor for University Relations, City University of New York, remarked that his institution represents one extreme in approaching the access problem; CUNY was probably ahead of its time in following a fairly simplistic formula in developing access. The formula is simply open admissions plus free tuition for undergraduate education, supported primarily by the City of New York but also by the state. Under the formula, roughly 80 percent of the city's high school graduates go on to higher education.

Though the open admissions policy is only four years old, free undergraduate tuition has been a part of New York's university system for about 127 years. It has become an inviolable political fact of life in the City of New York, and no major candidate of any party has attacked it in recent history. Within the last several years, legislation has been introduced in the New York State Legislature to reinstitute tuition-free undergraduate education at units of the state university as well. So even though legislative concern with access related to free tuition waned in the period immediately following the 1969 change in state policy, the advent of open admissions and the very marked increase in enrollments led legislators to consider reinstituting this principle upstate.

In the matter of federal-state relations, CUNY takes the view that accessibility may be enhanced nationally by federal programs that give credit to state and local efforts. The State of New York has its own revenue-sharing program, initiated three years ago.

Instead of an emphasis on complex and highly sophisticated formulae for direct student aid, the federal aid program should be more forthright, taking into account the efforts of localities and states to reduce tuition and their success in encouraging access; measures of these efforts and achievements are fairly easy to come by.

Carol Van Alstyne, at a conference on tuition, concluded her formal paper by saying that we ought to consider, in broad terms, the place of postsecondary education among national priorities.[2] This, indeed, is where the debate ought to be. We are now dealing with a college-going population proportionately far in excess of the secondary school population at the time that free secondary education was established in this country. Many people in the population which is so visible in New York City have never encountered higher education before -- not just people in ghetto areas but those in blue-collar white ethnic neighborhoods. These people for the first time have someone in their family enrolled in postsecondary education. The attitudes of local legislators have changed in terms of support for the CUNY budget in the city and in the state. In both parties, and in both local and state government, there is immediate interest among congressional delegations in this particular area.

The remarks made by Dr. Austin are pertinent here: There ought to be some consideration of means to encourage effort at the state and local levels, means which will provide general access while at the same time minimizing the bureaucracy that might impinge upon accessibility, means that would fairly provide choice and integration so that we do not have schisms in terms of the economic strata of society. Public institutions should not be relegated to taking the castoffs that cannot quite make it economically into the private institutions.

---

[2] See Carol Van Alstyne, "Tuition: Analysis of Recent Policy Recommendations," in Exploring the Case for Low Tuition in Public Higher Education, ed. Kenneth E. Young (Iowa City, Iowa: American Association of State Colleges and Universities, American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, American College Testing Program, 1974), pp. 33-103.

## A Challenge from the Private Sector

Hans Jenny, Vice-President of Wooster College (Ohio) and a representative of the private sector, summarized his own views on federal and state policy. The role that Congress and the federal agencies have been carrying out is to articulate national objectives. The federal purpose is to encourage greater balance in policies that may differ from state to state, to bring about redress where redress is an obvious necessity, and to create incentives for states to do things that they might otherwise not do. It is the common view that the state is the repository of the primary responsibility for higher education; but the state also has a responsibility to plan for, and with, the entire sector of higher education within the state and not to create any more disparities among types of institutions, specifically between public and private institutions. There is considerable evidence that, in the last ten years, state planning has not taken into account the existing potential resources--public and private--that are available.

So far, the speakers have talked about access, seeming to take it for granted that student-centered aid is a primary solution. What should be of concern to all of us is the question, Will the student be able to perform once he has achieved access? And is student-centered support the best or only way to provide means for the student to be able to perform? It is not sufficient just to get students into institutions and then return to the phenomenon of the 1950s: namely, flunking them out after the first quarter or the first semester. We should want to get students through without diminishing the quality of the educational output.

The rules of the game -- which are now being imposed on the private sector -- force those institutions that want to remain selective into a position that will not maximize, and may indeed minimize, access without there being available additional resources. The basic question is not whether these resources are available to the institution or to the student but whether they are available for the right objectives.

Another matter that should be of concern to all educators was discussed in a recent article by Warren Bryan Martin,[3] in which he questioned the ethics of those institutions whose primary goal now, whatever their selectivity in the past, is to recruit students so that they can pay the bills. A problem has arisen because of the distortions that have been created in the market for financing. What is happening to institutional quality? What is happening to the morality of those institutions that are simply out to get warm bodies so they can continue to survive? We ought to address ourselves to the question of quality and objectives, not simply to the quantitative aspects of access.

## The Paradox of "Access"

The final speaker was Robert Carbone, Professor of Higher Education at the University of Maryland and director of a year-long project on alternative tuition systems. This project, sponsored by the American Association of State Colleges and Universities and the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, seeks to develop new methods of handling the flow of tuition from students to institutions in response to changing residency rules and age of majority laws.[4]

The term access -- like most such terms in education -- means different things to different people. If we view the term at two very different levels of abstraction, we can then consider what the federal and state responsibilities are, how well these responsibilities have been met, and what might be done in the future to increase student access to higher education.

At the first level, access can be defined in rather practical and pragmatic terms: Access is the opportunity for entering a postsecondary educational program that is readily at hand -- that is, within easy commuting distance of where the student lives.

---

[3] "The Ethical Crisis in Education," Change, June 1974, pp. 28-33.

[4] See Robert Carbone, Alternative Tuition Systems, ACT Special Report Twelve (Iowa City, Iowa: American College Testing Program, 1974) for a report of the results of this project.

Proximity is the key in this definition, and the basic goals underlying this concept of access are easily identified: keeping educational costs as low as possible for the student; extending general education beyond the high school; training personnel to satisfy manpower needs, particularly local manpower needs; reducing the number of young adults in the labor market; enhancing the local intellectual/cultural environment; and so on.

At the second level, access takes on a broad societal meaning: Access is the availability of a variety of educational opportunities in diverse settings. Mobility is the key in this definition. Added to the practical goals just mentioned is the social goal of developing a better integrated and more cohesive nation.

A passage from an article by Amitai Etzioni, Director of the Center for Policy Research at Columbia University, illustrates what is meant by the societal level of accessibility. He says:

> Socially, America has long been an under-integrated society. It is more heterogeneous than most societies because it is larger, more populous, and has a greater variety of subcultures. It also lacks the unifying effects of a dominant institutionalized religion (as in Spain), of a centralized school system with a unified curriculum (as in France), or universal draft (as in Israel). No wonder intergroup conflicts are often more intense, and interregional tensions higher, than in these countries. The colleges, in which future leaders of America . . . and about half of its citizens are educated, are the place where many crisscrossing ties may be evolved and a shared national perspective may be developed. Thus, on both personal and social accounts, interstate flows of students should be encouraged rather than hindered. . . . Colleges are usually the first real chance, and often the last, for a great societal mixer, a place where people of all backgrounds coming from different regions will get to know each other as persons and not as stereotypes.[5]

The Scorecard

How well have the states and the federal government done in increasing access at both these levels?

---

[5]"Interstate Integration of Students," Educational Forum, Vol. 38, No. 2 (1974), p. 224.

At the first level -- access to a local educational institution -- quite well indeed. Evidence:

- new campuses, especially local community colleges
- new branches of existing colleges and universities
- new opportunities for adult learners through evening classes or noncredit work
- extended instruction (university-without-walls, etc.)

Access has been increased largely through the efforts of local and state governments. The federal role is less obvious, although construction grants and funds for special programs have helped.

At the second level -- access in its broad societal meaning -- the states and the federal government have not done so well. As a matter of fact, there has been an actual reduction in access when it is viewed at this level. Specifically, more and more students find that they can no longer afford to enter the college of their choice, especially if that college is located in another state or, at least, is not near where the student lives.

We seem to be moving two directions at once: increasing access at the local level but losing ground at the societal level. What has caused this seemingly paradoxical situation?

The most obvious factor is skyrocketing educational costs. The sharp increase in student charges at both private and public institutions has restricted student mobility and reduced our chances of maintaining access at the societal level. Private colleges have simply priced many students out of the market since students cannot pay high tuition plus high living costs plus the cost of transportation several times a year. As a result, access has been reduced. Our public colleges and universities -- which now enroll three-quarters of all our students -- have restricted access by nonresident (out-of-state) students in three ways. About one-third of public four-year institutions have quotas on the admission on nonresidents; about one in ten have admission standards that are higher for nonresidents than for residents; and virtually all public institutions have dramatically increased the tuition differential that nonresident students must

pay. Between 1965-66 and 1972-73, the average tuition differential for land-grant institutions and major state universities (the NASULGC institutions) increased from $423 to $802 per year, an 89.6 percent jump. Actually, tuition levels for both resident and nonresident students have been rising, but the differential between these two fee levels has been increasing at an even faster rate. Here are the figures (again using only NASULGC institutions): Between 1968 and 1971, the average resident tuition increased from $360 to $482, a 34 percent increase. The average nonresident tuition increased from $905 to $1,260, a 39 percent increase. This means, for example, that in North Carolina -- the state with the highest differential, a nonresident student must pay $2,000 per year: $400 tuition and $1,600 out-of-state fee. Vermont charges a lower differential ($1,450) but the highest total fee ($2,835). Thus, high costs are driving students away from private colleges and universities and are discouraging students from migrating across state borders to attend public colleges and universities.

Enrollment figures reported by the US Office of Education over the years show what these rising costs have done to student migration in America. In 1968 the total enrollment in all institutions was 6.9 million; and of these students, about 1.1 million were migrant students: 445,000 in public institutions and 655,000 in private institutions. Three years later, in 1971, total enrollment was 8.1 million -- a 17 percent overall increase -- yet the number of migrating students hardly changed at all. (It should be emphasized that these are <u>estimates</u> since hard data are not available. The National Center for Educational Statistics is not collecting the data in the same format they used in the past.)

A 1971 survey of public four-year colleges and universities showed that, while their total enrollments had increased by 22 percent from 4.9 million to 6 million since 1968, the number of nonresident students had increased by only 20,000, a mere 5 percent rise. During the same time span, total private college enrollments increased by 100,000, but the number of migrating students they enrolled are estimated to have decreased by 8 percent. Thus,

while there were 1.2 million more students in college in 1971 than in 1968, there were only about 15,000 more migrant students enrolled.

These data suggest that access for students who seek to leave their home states to attain a college education has diminished even though greater at-home educational opportunities may exist. As usual, the reasons appear to be financial. If this is indeed the case, the future responsibilities of state and federal government in providing access seem to be clear: They must devise ways to stimulate student migration and mobility.

Increasing Student Choice

"My own view is that a system which provides free, or almost free, access to a public institution of higher learning to all qualified students is the simplest and most effective method of insuring enrollment of qualified and near-poor students." These are the words of Dr. Joseph A. Pechman, Director of Economic Studies at the Brookings Institution.[6] Of course, he was talking only about public higher education, but the principle seems to apply to private colleges as well.

To achieve better access to higher education at both levels -- the local and the societal -- state and federal governments must find a way to increase the variety of educational opportunities open to any student. This means having something more than just an opportunity within close proximity. Our governments, state and federal, must begin increasing the possibility that any qualified student can enroll in any college that will accept his or her credentials anywhere in the United States.

---

[6] The Distributional Effects of Public Higher Education in California," Journal of Human Resources, Summer 1970, pp. 1-9.